



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,178	12/31/2003	Ariel Peled	27153	5563
67801	7590	05/11/2010		
MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 16446			GYOREI, THOMAS A	
ARLINGTON, VA 22215				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2435		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/11/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/748,178

Applicant(s)

PELED ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas Gyorfi

Art Unit

2435

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80,107-130,147 and 148 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80,107-130,147 and 148 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-80, 107-130, 147, and 148 remain for examination. The amendment filed 2/25/10 amended claims 1 and 73.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/25/10 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 2/25/10 have been fully considered but, except where otherwise noted, they are not persuasive. Regarding Ginter, Applicant argues:

Applicants argued in the previous response that Ginter does not teach monitoring a user's actions on a computer workstation.
It is respectfully noted that Examiner appears not to have related to this argument.
Applicants respectfully repeat this argument.
Specifically Ginter column 1 lines 20-30 teaches:

The invention also relates to secure chains of handling and control for both information content and information employed to regulate the use of such content and consequences of such use. It also relates to systems and techniques that manage, including meter and/or limit and/or otherwise monitor use of electronically stored and/or disseminated information. The invention particularly relates to transactions, conduct and arrangements that make use of, including consequences of use of, such systems and/or techniques.

Applicants believe that there is nothing in the above passage that relates to monitoring of user's actions, contrary to the requirements of the claim.

The feature a) is not an isolated feature but is in fact tied in with the continuation of the claim, since it is the monitored user actions which are compared with the policy. This tie-in is thus also absent from the citations.

An example of what the claim requires is described in the present Application. A user presses the print button. The pressing of the print button by the user is monitored against a policy to determine whether the information may be printed or is restricted from printing.

That is to say the above - cited passage contains no teaching of the claimed feature, or even a hint at its existence. Neither for that matter is there any hint at a need for such a feature. Furthermore the feature, even if provided, would not solve any problem or fulfill any useful function in either of the cited documents.

Applicants in fact wonder whether the reference was erroneous and the Examiner intended some other passage. Applicants have diligently checked the Application but can find no such passage, and respectfully await the Examiner's further guidance on this point.

While the Examiner is willing to concede that Ginter's truly heroic verbosity would make the analysis of this reference a daunting task, nevertheless Examiner respectfully submits that Applicant has utterly failed to grasp even the basic premise of the Ginter invention. The Ginter reference discloses a new form of digital rights management technology – the "Virtual Distribution Environment", or "VDE" - that can be universally applied to any and all forms of digital content, and ensure that whatever rights may be granted to a user be enforced by any type of device that could process said content. With Ginter having expended considerable effort disclosing the ability to specify what rights and policies govern a user's ability to access arbitrary content, it should be self-evident that this system must necessarily possess some form of enforcement mechanism for that invention to have any utility whatsoever. From the passage cited by the Examiner and quoted by the Applicant above, the Examiner was referring to Ginter's admittedly cursory description therein of "systems and techniques that...monitor use of electronically stored and/or disseminated information" being at least suggestive of the

ability of a VDE-enabled computer to monitor a user's actions when the user is trying to do something with a piece of protected content. Examiner earnestly solicits Applicant's opinion as to how Ginter's DRM-related invention – i.e. an invention specifically designed to restrict the use of content to the degree that said content specifies – would be capable of enforcing any of these rights and policies on digital content if, as Applicant alleges, that Ginter does not so much as hint at the ability to monitor a user's actions on a workstation with respect to accessing content.

However, in response to Applicant's request for further guidance, Examiner is happy to provide additional citations from Ginter that, when taken together, perhaps better support the limitation(s) in question, as well as the claims in general:

- Ginter's VDE technology can be applied to protect content as diverse as (but not limited to) music, movies, video games, newspapers, medical records, tax records, and employment records (col. 4, lines 14-27)
- VDE can audit and analyze the use of content to ensure that it is used only in authorized ways (col. 4, lines 45-50)
- VDE can be implemented on any type of hardware, ranging from a small handheld device to a large mainframe computer (col. 4, lines 59-61)
- Ginter specifically names workstations as a permissible implementation of the VDE system (col. 249, lines 39-53; col. 250, lines 20-60; Figure 70)
- VDE can be incorporated into a computer to enforce various specific means of using content, including *inter alia* the printing use case described by the Applicant *supra* (col. 9, lines 19-32)

- a VDE-augmented application [such as a word processor] can monitor a user's actions to ensure that only permitted actions may be performed (e.g. col. 26, lines 37-65; see also col. 61, lines 19-34; and col. 337, lines 19-33)
- VDE allows for finer-grained control, and restriction of use, not just to the entirety of a document but to specific portions thereof (col. 306, line 40 – col. 307, line 5)

These citations only begin to scratch the surface of the substance behind the Ginter disclosure; yet the Examiner trusts that this should be a sufficient starting point for suggesting that the Ginter invention would obviously encompass the ability to "monitor a user's actions on a computer workstation" as per the claims.

4. Regarding claim 107 and the Java reference, Applicant argues:

Claim 107 teaches inter alia feature a)

"detecting an event occurring at said workstation, said event being associated with content;"

Examiner, in rejecting this feature, points to Venner, and the heading "The Security Manager and the Java API.

This passage teaches that a sandbox is used to enforce a security policy. The security policy may include a list of features such as accepting a socket connection or closing an application.

Applicants respectfully point out that there is not a whisper of *detecting an event associated with content*. The passage pointed to *does not mention content*, does not mention events associated with content and does not in fact mention *events*" at all.

Thus the later feature of using statistics to identify the content, is also not fulfilled by the prior art since "the content" refers to that which was associated with the detected event, and *no content* is associated by Venner with *any* detected event.

Examiner disagrees, as Applicant appears to be relying on an overly literal interpretation of the Venners reference. The instant specification provides one permissible interpretation of the claim term "event" as:

In another preferred embodiment of the present invention, the events comprise events required for any of:
printing the information;

copying the information;
storing the information; and
displaying the information.

(page 5, lines 1-6; emphasis Examiner's)

The Examiner has understood the claim term "events" to refer not necessarily mean "printing", "copying", etc. but rather *the events required for* printing, copying, etc.; i.e. the underlying steps involved in those actions. Note that among the bulleted list of conditions that trigger a response from the Java security manager are *inter alia* the ability to "Read from a specified file" and "write to a specified file" (last two bullets on page 2). One of ordinary skill in the art would have immediately intuited the following:

- "Printing" a file requires the ability to read the content from a file, in order to communicate said content thereof to the printer
- "Copying" a file requires the ability to read the content from one file and write said content to another file, either newly created or overwriting an existing file
- "Storing" a file requires the ability to write content to a file on a storage medium
- "Displaying" a file requires the ability to read the content of a file, in order to communicate said content thereof to the display means

Consequently, under the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim terms Examiner thus understands the Venners reference to teach the ability to detect events related to content, despite the explicit lack of the words "event" and "content" in the actual text thereof.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 73-80 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
7. Claims 1-80, 107-130, 147, and 148 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al (U.S. Patent 5,892,900) in view of Gilmour (U.S. Patent 6,205,472).

Regarding claims 1 and 110:

Ginter discloses a method and system for computer workstation based information protection, comprising: monitoring user's actions on said computer workstation (col. 1, lines 20-30); analyzing said monitored action in respect to a predefined policy associated with any confidential information identified by said analysis as being associated with said content in use at said workstation, to determine whether said actions prejudice information to which the policy applies (col. 302, line 40 – col. 303, line 40); and executing said policy in accordance with the results of said analysis to control said actions (Ibid).

Although Ginter discloses using statistics and statistical analysis in the disclosed system (col. 105, lines 15-50), it appears to be silent regarding using the statistical analysis for the specific purpose of identifying confidential information. However, Gilmour discloses a general technique for data management using statistical analysis with a number of identifiers to determine within a given confidence level if confidential information is present (the second matching step of col. 2, lines 20-50; identifiers at col.

13, lines 15-25; more detail at col. 21, lines 10-50). The claims are thus obvious because the ability to use statistical analysis to identify confidential data was a technique that was within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of its teaching for improvement in similar situations.

Regarding claims 2 and 111:

Ginter further discloses wherein said policy comprises restrictions on at least one of: print, save, copy, autosave, fax (col. 252, line 40 – col. 253, line 30).

Regarding claims 3 and 112:

Ginter further discloses wherein said monitoring said user's actions on said workstation computer comprise detection of indications of attempts of tampering (col. 85, lines 45-57).

Regarding claim 4:

Ginter further discloses obtaining logical indications or statistical indications (Ibid, and col. 88, lines 10-50).

Regarding claims 5 and 113:

Ginter further discloses detection of at least one uncertified add-in (col. 85, lines 45-65, noting that uncertified add-ons would not be validated).

Regarding claim 6:

Ginter further discloses noting that said uncertified add-in is hooked to event of a local operating system (Ibid).

Regarding claims 7 and 114:

Ginter further discloses detection of at least one debugging technique (col. 88, lines 10-50).

Regarding claim 8:

Ginter further discloses wherein said debugging technique comprises any of a debugger, virtual machine, software emulator, software trap, and remote administration tool (Ibid).

Regarding claims 9 and 115:

Ginter further discloses wherein said policy comprises restrictions of actions made available to said user upon detection of indications of attempts of tampering (col. 176, lines 5-20).

Regarding claims 10 and 116:

Ginter further discloses applying restrictions on actions within a software application operable to process said information (col. 308, line 40 – col. 307, line 5).

Regarding claim 11:

Ginter further discloses performing at least one action upon detection of indications of attempts at tampering (col. 205, lines 40-60).

Regarding claim 12:

Ginter further discloses at least one of encrypting at least one buffer, and encrypting at least one shared memory (col. 199, line 33 – col. 200, line 22).

Regarding claim 13

Ginter further discloses wherein said actions comprise preventing the decryption of encrypted digital content (col. 205, lines 40-60).

Regarding claim 14:

Ginter further discloses wherein said pre-defined policy is defined with respect to a software application on said user's workstation (col. 311, lines 30-60).

Regarding claim 15:

Ginter further discloses wherein said policy comprises reporting about attempts to perform actions that do not comply with an organization policy or are suspected to not comply with the organizational policy (col. 145, lines 25-50).

Regarding claim 16:

Ginter further discloses wherein said policy comprises performing logging of attempts to perform actions that do not comply or are suspected to not comply with the organizational policy (Ibid).

Regarding claim 17:

Ginter further discloses protecting information held within a software data processing application able to process said information (col. 308, line 40 – col. 307, 5).

Regarding claim 18:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software data processing application operates in conjunction with a software client (Ibid).

Regarding claims 19 and 117:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software client is tamper resistant (col. 87, line 60 – col. 88, line 10).

Regarding claims 20 and 118:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software client is operable to monitor a user's actions and to execute said policy (col. 307, lines 1-5).

Regarding claims 21 and 119:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software client is operable to monitor said user's actions and policy (Ibid).

Regarding claims 22 and 120:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software client is further operable to detect events of said software application (col. 42, lines 15-40).

Regarding claim 23:

Ginter further discloses wherein said events comprise any of: printing, copying storing, and displaying said information (col. 251, line 60 – col. 252, line 40).

Regarding claims 24 and 121:

Ginter further discloses wherein said policy further comprises managing usage rights (col. 33, lines 35-65).

Regarding claim 25:

Ginter further discloses wherein said usage rights are determined according to any of the classification of the document, the classification level of the user, and the authentication level of the user (col. 302, lines 50-55).

Regarding claims 26 and 122:

Ginter further discloses wherein the usage rights comprise any of viewing at least part of said information; modifying at least part of said information; sending at least part of said information to a recipient; storing at least part of said information; storing at least part of said information by an application; storing at least part of said information by a file system; storing at least part of said information in a portable device; storing at least part of said information in a removable media; storing at least part of said information in a portable storage device that is connected to said workstation using a USB port; pasting at least part of said information into a document; printing at least part of said information; printing at least part of said information to file; printing at least part of said information to a fax, and printing a screen view document (col. 156, line 60 – col. 157, line 20).

Regarding claim 27:

Ginter further discloses wherein said policy comprises definition of actions to be performed (col. 189, line 40 – col. 190, line 35).

Regarding claim 28:

Ginter further discloses wherein said actions comprise any of: enabling usage of at least part of said information, disabling usage of at least part of said information; restricting usage of at least part of said information according to a pre-determined set of

restrictions; reporting about the usage of at least part of said information, and monitoring the usage of at least part of said information (*Ibid*).

Regarding claim 29:

Ginter further discloses wherein restriction of usage imposes requiring encryption of at least part of said protected information (col. 14, lines 25-50).

Regarding claim 30:

Ginter further discloses wherein said required encryption is such that corresponding encrypted information can be decrypted only by a secure client (*Ibid*).

Regarding claim 31:

Ginter further discloses wherein said restriction of usage requires said protected information to reside on a secure server (col. 106, lines 40-55).

Regarding claim 32:

Ginter further discloses arranging a connection between said secure server and said workstation such that the transport between said secure server and said workstation is protected (col. 12, lines 30-40).

Regarding claim 33:

Ginter further discloses wherein said protected transport comprises encrypted transport (*Ibid*).

Regarding claim 34:

Ginter further discloses encryption of a file comprising at least part of said protected information wherein said file is at least one of the following: temporary file and auto-recovery file (col. 173, lines 13-67).

Regarding claim 35:

Ginter further discloses a file comprising at least part of said protected information, wherein said file comprises any of temporary file and auto-recover file (Ibid).

Regarding claim 36:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software client authenticates itself to a server before at least some of the sessions (col. 36, lines 10-45; col. 168, lines 45-67).

Regarding claim 37:

Ginter further discloses wherein said authentication depends on a classification level assigned to protected information (col. 302, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 38:

Ginter further discloses wherein authentication is any of password based or network address based (col. 199, lines 5-10).

Regarding claim 39:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software client comprises components that can be automatically replaced (col. 16, lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 40:

Ginter further discloses wherein said secure server employs cryptographic encryption of at least one file containing said protected information (col. 37, lines 45-55).

Regarding claim 41:

Ginter further discloses wherein communication with said server is substantially transparent to said user (col. 34, lines 40-50).

Regarding claim 42:

Ginter further discloses wherein in accordance with said policy said protected information is encrypted utilizing the encryption capabilities of said software application (col. 22, lines 1-5).

Regarding claims 43 and 125:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software application operable to process said information is a word processing application (col. 301, lines 30-40).

Regarding claim 44:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software application comprises a control flag imparting the status of either read only or lock to a corresponding file, and wherein file modification within said software application which is operable to process said information is disabled via said flag (col. 247, lines 50-57).

Regarding claim 45:

Ginter further discloses wherein said disabling of said file modification is controlled by said policy (Ibid).

Regarding claim 46:

Ginter further discloses wherein said policy comprises adding forensic information to said protected information (col. 201, line 45 – col. 202, line 5).

Regarding claims 47 and 126:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software client replaces the clipboard functionality of said software application thereby to process said protected information with a secure clipboard functionality (col. 323, lines 10-55).

Regarding claim 48:

Ginter further discloses wherein said protected information copied into said secure clipboard is stored in an internal data structure inaccessible to other applications (Ibid).

Regarding claims 49 and 127:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software client is installed automatically from a remote server (col. 237, lines 20-40).

Regarding claims 50 and 128:

Ginter further discloses wherein said installation of said software client utilizes anti-virus installation infrastructure (col. 240, lines 15-42).

Regarding claim 51:

Ginter further discloses wherein updates of said software client utilizes anti-virus installation infrastructure (Ibid).

Regarding claim 52:

Ginter further discloses wherein at least part of the software code of said software client resides in an encrypted form (col. 237, lines 20-40).

Regarding claim 53:

Ginter further discloses wherein at least part of the software code of said software client is attached to hardware of said computer workstation (col. 87, 5-30).

Regarding claim 54:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software client is operable to automatically add information to said protected information in accordance with said policy (col. 201, line 45 – col. 202, line 5).

Regarding claim 55:

Ginter further discloses wherein said added information comprises any of a document header, footer, or textual disclaimer (col. 135, lines 20-35).

Regarding claim 56:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software client is operable to open file that comprises said protected information only while connected to at least one server (col. 109, lines 20-67).

Regarding claim 57:

Ginter further discloses wherein said servers enforce policy with respect to said information (col. 302, lines 40-60).

Regarding claim 58:

Ginter further discloses wherein said policy implies a set of restrictions regarding the usage of said protected information (col. 214, lines 15-40).

Regarding claim 59:

Ginter further discloses wherein the client software is operable to check that it is connected to a predetermined server before decrypting a file that comprises protected information (col. 109, lines 20-67).

Regarding claim 60:

Ginter further discloses wherein said servers enforce a policy with respect to said protected information, and wherein said policy comprises a set of restrictions regarding the usage of said protected information (col. 214, lines 15-40).

Regarding claim 61:

Ginter further discloses wherein at least two servers are operable to define said policy (col. 307, lines 25-55).

Regarding claim 62:

Ginter further discloses wherein in the event of two or more conflicting policies are found, a strictest one of the policies is identified and used (col. 43, line 55 – col. 44, line 15).

Regarding claim 63:

Ginter further discloses wherein in the event of two or more conflicting policies are found, a union of the policies is identified and used (Ibid).

Regarding claim 64:

Ginter further discloses wherein connection to at least two servers are required in order to determine policy (col. 307, lines 25-55).

Regarding claim 65:

Ginter further discloses wherein said server authenticates the integrity of said client by requiring a cryptographic hash of at least part of said client's software (col. 223, lines 45-67).

Regarding claim 66:

Ginter further discloses wherein said cryptographic hash is with respect to a random address in said client's software (col. 131, line 27 – col. 132, line 13).

Regarding claim 67:

Ginter further discloses wherein said client is entangled with said server's software, such that a functioning stand-alone copy of said client's software does not exist (col. 103, lines 45-67).

Regarding claim 68:

Ginter further discloses wherein said method comprises at least two levels of protection, and wherein said levels of protection are operable to be configured as a function of the secrecy of said protected information (col. 302, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 69:

Ginter further discloses wherein in the most secure of said levels of protection, said protected information can only be accessed while connected to said server (col. 103, lines 45-67).

Regarding claim 70:

Ginter further discloses wherein in at least one of said levels of protection, said information can be accessed for a limited time after the connection with said server was terminated (col. 32, lines 50-60).

Regarding claim 71:

Ginter further discloses wherein at least one of said levels of protection, said information can be accessed until the end of a current login session (col. 103, 45-67).

Regarding claim 72:

Ginter further discloses wherein in at least one of said levels of protection, said information can be unlimitedly accessed after the server approves the information (col. 198, lines 50-60).

Regarding claims 73 and 130:

Ginter discloses a method and system for information protection comprising: defining an information protection policy with respect to an information item, said defining comprising at least one measure, required to be enforced by said workstation, in said policy to protect said information item (col. 300, lines 40-50; workstations at col. 303, lines 40-50); and allowing usage on a computer workstation of content comprising said information item only while required measures in said policy are being applied by said workstation (col. 302, line 40 – col. 303, line 40).

Although Ginter appears to disclose the use of identifiers from a content identifier database to identify protected information items (such as traveling objects: see col. 138, lines 43-62; and col. 305, line 45 – col. 306, line 5), Ginter does not explicitly disclose the use of statistical analysis in the process. However, Gilmour discloses a general technique for data management using statistical analysis with a number of identifiers to determine within a given confidence level if confidential information is present (the second matching step of col. 2, lines 20-50; identifiers at col. 13, lines 15-25; more detail at col. 21, lines 10-50). The claims are thus obvious because the ability to use statistical analysis to identify confidential data was a technique that was within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of its teaching for improvement in similar situations.

Regarding claim 74:

Ginter further discloses protecting information with a client software application (col. 26, lines 35-65).

Regarding claim 75:

Ginter further discloses disabling at least one of the controls of said application (e.g. disabling the print ability when a document should not be printed: col. 250, line 40 - col. 251, line 18).

Regarding claim 76:

Ginter further discloses wherein said information protection measures comprise encryption of the memory of a graphic card or video card (col. 250, line 40 – col. 251, line 60, but particularly col. 250, lines 52-55 and col. 251, lines 30-40).

Regarding claim 77:

Ginter further discloses wherein said information protection measures comprises forcing a video card or a graphic card to a mode that causes no meaningful information to be stored in said video card's memory (an *encrypted* VDE-object in the graphics card memory is meaningless without the ability to decrypt, which an attacker would not be able to do: Ibid).

Regarding claim 78:

Ginter further scanning at least one storage device and identifying the existence of pre-defined information objects (i.e. using a VDE for document control: col. 302, lines 15-40; VDE-enabled storage devices at col. 250, lines 40-60).

Regarding claim 79:

Ginter further discloses wherein said pre-defined objects comprise confidential information objects (col. 302, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 80:

Ginter further discloses at least one rule regarding at least one event of at least one software application operable to handle said information (e.g. a printing rule applied to a VDE-enabled word processor: col. 26, lines 35-65).

Regarding claim 107:

Ginter discloses a method for computer workstation based information protection, comprising: detecting an event occurring at said workstation, said event being associated with content (col. 42, line 17 – col. 43, line 20; col. 58, lines 20-50); and employing information of said event to protection of said confidential (Ibid).

Although Ginter appears to disclose the use of identifiers from a content identifier database to identify protected information items (such as traveling objects: see col. 138, lines 43-62; and col. 305, line 45 – col. 306, line 5), Ginter does not explicitly disclose the use of statistical analysis in the process. However, Gilmour discloses a general technique for data management using statistical analysis with a number of identifiers to determine within a given confidence level if confidential information is present (the second matching step of col. 2, lines 20-50; identifiers at col. 13, lines 15-25; more detail at col. 21, lines 10-50). The claims are thus obvious because the ability to use statistical analysis to identify confidential data was a technique that was within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of its teaching for improvement in similar situations.

Regarding claim 108:

Ginter further discloses handling an event (Ibid), said event being designated as directing information protection (Ibid), and employing said information protection technique in reaction to said event (Ibid).

Regarding claim 109:

Ginter further discloses wherein said event comprise any of: loading a local operating system, loading an application, user action, presenting a specific information into the system, an event generated by another system, suspicious activity, operating system time event, and a network time event (e.g. a user requesting to access protected content: col. 58, Ibid).

Regarding claim 123:

Ginter further discloses wherein said client software is operable to check that it is connected to a predetermined server before decrypting a file that comprise said protected information only while connected to at least one server (col. 305, lines 15-25).

Regarding claim 124:

Ginter further discloses wherein said servers enforce a policy with respect to said protected information, and wherein said policy comprises a set of restrictions regarding the usage of the said protected information (col. 341, lines 1-25).

Regarding claim 129:

Ginter further discloses wherein said software is operable to automatically add information to said protected information in accordance with said policy (col. 32, 25-35).

Regarding claims 147 and 148:

Ginter further discloses wherein controlling a user's action comprises at least one of preventing said action, monitoring said action, or logging said action (col. 303, 3-20).

8. Claims 107-109 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Java Security: How to Install the Security Manager and Customize Your Security Policy" (hereinafter, "Venners") in view of Gilmour.

Regarding claim 107:

Venners discloses a method for computer workstation based information protection comprising: detecting an event at said workstation, said event being associated with content (pages 1-2, "The Security Manager and the Java API"); directing handling of said event (Ibid); and employing information protection based on an assessment of an importance of said event to protection of information indicated as requiring protection technique (Ibid; cf. page 3, "Security beyond the architecture").

Although Venners discloses managing file access (page 2, last two bullet points on the first list therein), it appears to be silent regarding managing file access on the basis of using statistical analysis to identify confidential information. However, Gilmour

discloses a general technique for data management using statistical analysis with a number of identifiers to determine within a given confidence level if confidential information is present (the second matching step of col. 2, lines 20-50; identifiers at col. 13, lines 15-25; more detail at col. 21, lines 10-50). The claims are thus obvious because the ability to use statistical analysis to identify confidential data was a technique that was within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of its teaching for improvement in similar situations.

Regarding claim 108:

Venners further discloses handling an event, said event being designated as directing information protection (pages 1-2, "The Security Manager and the Java API"); and employing a said information protection technique in reaction to said event (Ibid).

Regarding claim 109:

Venners discloses wherein said event comprise any of: loading a local operating system, loading an application, user action, presenting a specific information into the system, an event generated by another system, suspicious activity, operating system time event, and a network time event (bulleted list on page 2).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: pertinent to claims 107-109, the "StarOffice 6.0 Office Suite

Companion" reference teaches that both the StarOffice and OpenOffice applications mentioned explicitly by the instant application (specification, e.g. page 7, lines 21-22; cf. claims 43 and 125) were both implemented at least in part as Java applications (Haugland, page 9); furthermore the "C-Net News" reference teaches that it would be desirable to apply the Java security model (i.e. Venners) to an Office application suite (page 1, paragraphs 7-9), further suggesting that Venners is pertinent prior art.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Gyorfi whose telephone number is (571)272-3849. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TAG
5/5/10

/Kimyen Vu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435